UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,960	02/23/2007	Per Olof Magnus Magnusson	P19069-US1	8466

27045   7590   10/15/2008
ERICSSON INC.
6300 LEGACY DRIVE
M/S EVR 1-C-11
PLANO, TX 75024

EXAMINER
CHACKO, JOE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2456	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/15/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 February 2007*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.
　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *14 August 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date *8/14/2006,8/16/2006*.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   **Claims 1-16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Koskiahde (WO 03/047183 A1) in view of Veerapalli et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No.
2003/0153325 A1)

As to **claim 1**, Koskiahde discloses a system a data unit processing entity (fig.1,
30, home agent) in a data unit transmission network (fig.1) comprising: a plurality of
network nodes (fig.1, 10, mobile node, 20, correspondent node) , said plurality of
network nodes comprising routing nodes (fig.1, 30, home agent) and end nodes (fig.1,
10, mobile node, 20, correspondent node), said routing nodes being arranged to route
data units over said data unit transmission network in accordance with a routing
protocol (pg.6, 22-24), one or more of said end nodes being mobile nodes capable of
accessing said data unit transmission network over more than one link (pg.6, lines 27-
32; where mobile node can move from its home network to other links) , said network
nodes being arranged to distinguish between a first type routing address and a second
type routing address in said data units (pg.2, lines 28-32; where mobile nodes usually
have two routing addresses , one which is their home address and the other a
temporary address), said first type routing address (pg.2, lines 28; static home
addresses by which a mobile node is always identified) serving to identify network
nodes and said second type routing address (pg.2 ,lines 23-30; where each mobile

node has a temporary address called a care-of-address which identifies its current
location) serving to allow routing to mobile nodes, said data unit processing entity
comprising a decision part for setting the second type routing address (pg.7 , lines 8-9;
care-of-address) in a received data unit (pg.7,lines 2-4; where the binding update is
received by the home agent described the care-of-address) that is to be forwarded,

Koskiahde does not disclose a system with a decision part set in said received
data unit that is to be forwarded and on decision data stored in association with said first
type routing address in a decision data memory and a management part for said
decision data memory, where said management part provides an interface to said
decision data memory for modifying said decision data.

In an analogous art, Veerepalli et al discloses a system wherein an operation of
said decision part depending on the first type routing address ([0069]; where IP
address is provided to the mobile node based on the registration request from a mobile
node) set in said received data unit that is to be forwarded and on decision data stored
in association with said first type routing address in a decision data memory ([0071];
where the home agent stores information describing its mobile nodes so that it can
route data to the mobile node), said decision data comprising one or more second type
routing addresses ([0075]; care-of-address) and. a management part for said decision
data memory, where said management part provides an interface to said decision data
memory for modifying said decision data ([0058]; where a mobile node may change the
information regarding its IP address using a registration request message), said
interface is arranged to provide a network control function([0093]; where the home
agent has a database storing all the activity of the mobile nodes using a ICMP protocol)
with access to said decision data memory ([0093]; where a database is present in the
HA), independently of access provided to one or more mobile nodes.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary
skilled in the art to modify Koskiahde by incorporating a decision part for setting the
second type routing address and a management part for said decision data memory as
disclosed by Veerepalli et al . The rationale behind this is modification would be that a

person of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine the prior arts to achieve the claimed invention.

As to **claim 2**, Koskiahde does not explicitly discloses the system wherein said decision data comprises decision rules and decision parameters, wherein said interface is arranged for modifying said decision rules and decision parameters.

Veerepalli et al . does discloses the system wherein said decision data ([0047]; " "mobility bindings") comprises decision rules([0047]; where "Care of Address" is used to route the data to the new location of the mobile node) and decision parameters([0047]; where "Limetime" is the time period for the address will be valid), wherein said interface is arranged for modifying said decision rules and decision parameters. ([0080]; where the home agent can detect and modify the mobility binding of the mobile node)

As to **claim 3**, Koskiahde does not explicitly disclose a system wherein said decision part is arranged to dynamically select one of said second type routing addresses from said decision data.

Veerepalli et al. does disclose the system said decision part is arranged to dynamically select one of said second type routing addresses ([0075]; where the home agent has mobility bindings which contain one or more records for each device) from said decision data. ([0076]; where the inactivity timer tracks the last time communication is received from node and then the home agent makes a decision accordingly)

As to **claim 4**, Koskiahde does not disclose a system wherein said decision part is arranged to perform said dynamic selection for each data unit to be forwarded.

Veerepalli et al. does disclose the system wherein said decision part is arranged to perform said dynamic selection for each data unit to be forwarded. ([0075]; where the home agent has mobility bindings which contain one or more records for each device)

As to **claim 5**, Koskiahde does not disclose a system wherein said interface is arranged to provide a plurality of control functions with access to said decision data

memory.

Veerepalli et al discloses a system wherein said interface is arranged to provide a plurality of control functions ([0071]; where the home agent stores information describing the mobile nodes to control flow of data) with access to said decision data memory.

As to **claim 6**, Koskiahde does not disclose a system wherein at least one of said control functions is located in one of said mobile nodes.

Veerapalli et al. discloses a system wherein at least one of said control functions is located in one of said mobile nodes. ([0066]; where the mobile node sends a registration request message to the home agent)

As to **claim 7**, Koskiahde does not disclose a system wherein one or more of said control functions are network resource management functions.

Veerapalli et al. does disclose a system wherein one or more of said control functions are network resource management functions. ([0071]; where home agent manages various kinds of resources to manage the network)

As to **claim 8**, Koskiahde does not explicitly disclose the system wherein the network control function is arranged to determine parameters of access links and be modified decision data based on parameter linked to the network,

Veerapalli et al. does disclose the system wherein said network control function is arranged to determine parameters related to access links ([0055]; where IP networks may be the Internet, an intranet, a private IP network) over which said mobile nodes access said data unit transmission network ([0055]; wireless communication system), and to modify said decision data in dependence on said parameters related to access links. ([0055] [0056]; the routing information concerning the different kinds of data across different links)

As to **claim 9**, this is a method corresponding to system in claim 1. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon system in claim 1.

As to **claim 10**, this is a method corresponding to system in claim 2. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon system in claim 2.

As to **claim 11**, this is a method corresponding to system in claim 3. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon system in claim 3.

As to **claim 12**, this is a method corresponding to system in claim 4. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon system in claim 4.

As to **claim 13**, this is a method corresponding to system in claim 5. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon system in claim 5.

As to **claim 14**, this is a method corresponding to system in claim 6. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon system in claim 6.

As to **claim 15**, this is a method corresponding to system in claim 7. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon system in claim 7.

As to **claim 16**, this is a method corresponding to system in claim 8. Therefore it has been analyzed and rejected based upon system in claim 8.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Liu et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0236914 A1

Oda et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0005886 A1

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOE CHACKO whose telephone number is (571)270-3318. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30am-5pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 2152

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152